

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/602,127	LOOMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1732

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) David H. Brinkman (Reg. No. 40,532) (4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 September 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

that of record.

Claims discussed:

independent claims 5, 10, 17, 22 and those dependent thereon.

Prior art documents discussed:

that of record.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Clarification of the the phrase "substantial length" of the flow restrictor was discussed. It was concluded that the phrase is equivalent to or interpreted as "substantially the entire length" as distinguisd from 'a partial length' which was discussed in applicant's remarks filed 20-AUG-2004..